

Illinois Human Services Commission
Framework Work Group

Thursday, October 31, 2013, 1 – 3pm
 Meeting Minutes

Meeting Attendance

Workgroup Participants	Organization	Attendance
Judith Gethner, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Illinois Partners for Human Services	x
Jim Lewis, <i>Co-Chair</i>	Chicago Community Trust	x
Michael Shaver	Children's Home + Aid	x
Jennifer Welch	City of Chicago	x
Maureen Fitzpatrick	Community College Board	x
Jennifer M. Orban	Crittenton Centers	x
S.A. Godinez	Department of Corrections	
Gladys Taylor	Department of Corrections	x
Michelle Saddler	Department of Human Services	x
Nelly Smyser- De Leon	Department of Human Services	x
Arthur Bishop	Department of Juvenile Justice	x
Steve McCurdy	GOMB	x
Christ Balich	Governor's Office	x
Mary –Lisa Sullivan	Governor's Office	x
Greg Wass	Governor's Office	
Sean Vinck	Governor's Office	x
Sharronne Ward	Grand Prairie Services	
Tim Moore	Grand Prairie Services	x
Amy Rynell	Heartland Alliance	
James Alexander	Illinois Action for Children	x
Vickie Smith	Illinois Coalition Against Domestic Violence	x
Ahlam Jbara	Illinois Coalition for Immigrant & Refugee Rights	x
Kathleen Monahan	Illinois Framework	x
Jackie Sharp	Lakeside Community Committee	x
Mary Hollie	Lawrence Hall Youth Services	x
Juan Calderon	Puerto Rican Cultural Center	x
Diane Williams	Safer Foundation	
Senator William Delgado	Senate D	
Melissa Trumbull Mitchell	The Federation of Community Schools	x
Mickey Finch	The Fellowship House	
Jack Kaplan	United Way of Metropolitan Chicago	x
Wendy Duboe	United Way of Metropolitan Chicago	
Grace Hou	Woods Fund of Chicago	

Staff	Organization	Attendance
Kathleen Monahan	Illinois Framework	x
Ryan Dougherty	Illinois Framework	x
John Connolly	Illinois Framework	x
Peter Eckart	Illinois Public Health Institute	x
Nicole Gillespie	Illinois Public Health Institute	x
Ellen Kaufmann	Illinois Public Health Institute	x
Rachel Reichlin	Illinois Public Health Institute	x

1	<p>Workgroup Co-chairs Jim Lewis and Judith Gethner welcomed the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewed the three goals of the HSC Stated that the Framework workgroup was intended to develop a work plan for addressing critical questions or issues related to the implementation of the Framework Goal is to identify actionable solutions, not to create a report
2	<p>State CIO Sean Vinck welcomed the group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Framework is not an agency or program, it's an ethos, a forum, a project Trying to model a different way of organizing the government Trying to change culture and institution and model behavior that may not be preceded Asking people in the public sector to do something revolutionary, we have to model what we want to see
3	<p>Framework Director Kathleen Monahan presented an overview of the Framework, and responded to participant questions and comments.</p> <p>Questions and discussion points during the presentation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Will the workgroup have access to the EAPD? Are costs included in it? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Yes, the Framework Workgroup will be given the EAPD and the schematic of the types of expenses included in it The EAPD outlines Illinois' attempt to coordinate projects, but the document is an aspirational projection It demonstrates the State's plan for attempting to resolve federal inefficiencies What is the price structure for the current vendor contract? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a set of fixed-cost deliverables that total approximately \$3 million. That work included mapping programs, reviewing business and IT processes, and identifying opportunities to move the Framework forward. Currently working to draft Statements of Work for other discrete projects: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For example, MMIS upgrade change management and assisting sister agencies to understand and align with MMIS

- What is the involvement of the Department of Juvenile Justice and the Department of Corrections? Are these agencies included in the scope of the Framework?
 - The Framework is formally established by an Intergovernmental Agreement
 - Goal is to have Juvenile Justice and Corrections added to the Framework scope within 12-18 months
 - At a minimum as a data-sharing partner, but prefer an “all in” approach
- How did you decide which programs are a part of the Framework?
 - Primarily had to do with client overlap, programs that interact with the same clients and therefore need to share information
 - There was a finite time within the procurement process to decide the scope, but we can add as appropriate
- You went through the mapping exercise with all 7 agencies and programs?
 - As part of the initial scan and triage process, the Planning Team interviewed business and technical staff of all 60 programs
 - Business process mapping is only one artifact; each program has a set of artifacts to understand how a program interacts with other programs
- How does the Framework apply to legacy systems that are already moving to new IT systems?
 - There are a lot of moving parts and initiatives in progress that we can’t prevent
 - We can make the best effort to ensure that, in the future, anything like that follows Federal guidelines for future funding, and guiding principles that the feds and the state agree to
- What is the evaluation process and timeframe to ensure we’re meeting goals? For example, the Juvenile Vendor Tracking System (Youth 360) and other projects that are central to the Department of Corrections and Juvenile Justice - what does it mean for the Framework to engage with them, evaluate them, and benefit each other?
 - There is an ongoing assessment of business processes and searching for opportunities to leverage existing projects; it’s an ongoing dynamic exercise
 - There are opportunities to interface and connect modularly with other initiatives like Youth 360, such as utilizing the Framework to maintain a comprehensive view of the person as they age-out of the juvenile system
 - Technology is the apparatus through which policy goals are expressed and achieved
- The overarching goal of the Framework is to create a common platform for state agency interaction 1) with customers 2) with the network of community providers and 3) among state agencies.
 - There’s a lot of things we *can* do, and that’s why we need this work group – for assistance with prioritization
- What does it mean to “break down the wall” between health and human services?
 - We want to link healthcare and social safety net services together under one system

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We already started with IES/ABE, a cross-agency effort with 1 application for multiple types of services ○ We want to leverage and expand existing portals (vs. building something for a particular program), and connect as many programs as possible to Medicaid to be eligible for the 90% federal match ○ We want business to drive any work we do, not technology <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We can get the technology, but we need to make policy decisions first ▪ It's the Framework's job to bring these people together for tough decisions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● How are we going to integrate local health departments with data integration? For example, there is a lot of funding and data collection that's not always reported; there are separate systems (city, state, and federal reporting structures). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ We can't ensure all of that, but we can work toward that ○ We have workgroups on confidentiality, enterprise approach, and data collection and sharing ○ We can ensure that the data that the state has is accessible and shared appropriately ● Are legislative or rule changes needed to permit this kind of data sharing? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The state is making every effort –legally and technically – to review existing policies to continue protecting privacy, confidentiality and security ○ We are only talking about appropriate, legal information ● In the case of Domestic Violence clients, we do not <i>collect</i> information <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The Framework has no plans to change or break the law ○ The goal is to work to share appropriate data with appropriate people, not to require new data collection or impose sharing from any program
4	<p>Kathleen closed her presentation with a proposal for two possible activities for the work group; two more arose in the subsequent discussion. Details on the discussion of the four possibilities are included below, and a draft delineation of the opportunities is provided as a separate document.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Outreach & Advocacy to legislators 2. Framework Scope (Adding IDOC and IDJJ) 3. Generic Consumer Data Screen 4. Performance Measures
5	<p>Discussion on the four proposed subgroup areas continued</p> <p>1) Outreach & Advocacy</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Will communications and messaging come out of the legislative support subcommittee? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Messaging pervades everything (legislators, provider community, leadership forums) 2. It is implicit in all sub-committees

3. Legislative support sub-committee is the key group

- As we're getting ready to approach legislators, we need a welcome packet (that has signatures of Directors, the Secretary, and committee members in support of the Framework)
 1. We have the signed IGA
 2. Legislative sub-committee will need to get informed, develop strategy for how to approach legislators and agree to what materials to distribute
- This group can help generate and maintain legislative support.
 1. We can help identify other communities that are not "usual suspects," but can be allies
 1. The Framework is bipartisan; there is no ideological limit (efficiencies, optimization, cost savings, improving health and human services)
 2. Determine who is on the short list of legislators
 2. Take on strategy of having those conversations
 3. We need to make sure that we have the messaging down so that we're not speaking off the cuff
 1. Recommendation for sub-committee to look at messaging strategy
- There are policy and governance issues that may need to be addressed via legislative channels, all of which need to be in alignment
- Especially in appropriations process, we will need to have an answer for why you're doing certain things and not others
 1. Advocating for funding is something this group can do.
 2. We need an awareness of other/related efforts
 3. The Framework may be portal for these other systems and efforts
 4. Recommendation to present at HSC meetings and appropriations meetings
 5. We need to advocate that funding needs to stay within agencies that provide services that we know are still needed
 1. Chronically mentally ill clients that may get lost in managed care – we need to be careful
- As we're getting ready to advocate to legislators, what is the price tag on this project? And what is your implementation process if it is funded? What is the timeline?
 1. There is not an "it"
 2. The Framework is not going to buy something and implement it. There is not one thing to solve all issues.
 3. We will share the price tag once the contract is awarded
 4. We can provide the breakdown of the budget to the workgroup
- We can point to intermediate wins, but what is the term of the project?
 1. There is federal funding through 2015
 2. The work won't be completed by 2015
 3. We're anticipating a convergence of agencies
 4. There is no "it" to be done, but trying to engage in ongoing dialogue; the work

is never done

2) Framework Scope (Adding IDOC and IDJJ)

- The mission of the Illinois Juvenile Justice and Leadership Council is to impact the state of Illinois in terms of data sharing. Where is there synergy within this workgroup? What other data discussions are going on? What are the other data resources? We need to merge these discussions when talking to legislators.
 1. The Departments of Juvenile Justice and Corrections are unique agencies and part of the HHS architecture. How can we integrate them?
 2. What are other existing data sharing efforts? How do we initiate dialogue and model a collaborative process?
 3. For the HHS environment, the way to leverage is to bring work that has already been produced (about confidentiality, aggregate data, etc.) to impact work that is yet to be done by this group. We can start with a dialogue about lessons learned.
- How do we leverage each other's resources? There is a lot of overlap with the Illinois Juvenile Justice and Leadership Council specifically.
 1. There is nothing inconsistent with Juvenile Justice being a part of Framework. How do we articulate that?
 2. Recommend workgroup team to present to Juvenile Justice leadership
- Proposed first action of this advisory group:
 1. Recommendation to the Framework governance team to engage Juvenile Justice and Corrections
 2. "All in," not just data sharing
 3. Not in phase 2, but right now in phase 1
 4. Sign the same IGA
- Proposed sub-committee of designees to articulate why the Departments of Juvenile Justice and Corrections need to be considered

3) Generic Consumer Data Screen

- We're talking about moving people toward their highest level of sufficiency (their "most self-sufficient"), are we talking about a snapshot of a client or family?
 1. As providers, we:
 1. want to make sure clients are accessing all the benefits they are entitled to
 2. if not, how can we connect them to services?
 3. how can we follow up to ensure they are receiving services?
- Many provider communities have invested in technology to build systems for a single client screen/file/information
- Our role is not to re-create the wheel but investigate/leverage what's already out there

	<p>4) Performance Measures</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are each of the state agencies going to hold local health departments accountable to ensure they share data? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That would be a great project for this workgroup; it's a gigantic project The collaboration that is envisioned is related to a subset of data that contains business procedures within the agencies and programs It is data that relates to internal procedural business processes, not meta data about populations served or outcomes achieved The role of the performance indicators and metrics sub-committee is to provide a voice for providers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Providers provide a lot of information to the state. We can provide input on how to turn that data into information that providers can use. Recommendation for separate conversations within organizations
6	<p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Co-chairs will report to the HSC on the outcomes of this workgroup meeting. IPHI will distribute meeting minutes. The Framework Workgroup may not convene again. The next step is for the subgroups to meet and begin developing a work plan. The timeline for the Framework Sub-workgroups is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> November – Review and discuss the charge for each subgroup. Sign-up for subgroup assignments and establish subgroup leaders. December – Draft and review subgroup charges, work plans and timelines January – Next full HSC meeting. Subgroups to propose work plan goals and timelines to the HSC for review and approval. February through April – Implement work plan. Develop a timeline for continuing efforts as needed. May – Review and edit draft sub workgroup updates for the legislature. Submit final updates to the HSC. June – Submit an update from each sub workgroup to the legislature. Outline timeline and work plans for any continuing efforts. The next full HSC meeting is in January.